

NO. PD-0243-20

IN THE
TEXAS COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
AT AUSTIN

FILED
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
11/6/2020
DEANA WILLIAMSON, CLERK

SANDRA JEAN MELGAR,
Appellant

VS.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

ON DISCRETIONARY REVIEW FROM THE
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTEENTH
SUPREME JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AT HOUSTON
CASE NUMBER 14-17-00932-CR

Appeal in Cause Number 1435566
In the 178th District Court
of Harris County, Texas

**MOTION FOR AUTHORIZATION TO EXCEED
THE WORD LIMIT IN APPELLANT'S BRIEF**

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF SAID COURT:

NOW COMES, SANDRA JEAN MELGAR, appellant in the above-styled and numbered cause, by and through her attorneys of record, George McCall Secrest, Jr., and Allison Secrest, and presents this Motion for Authorization to Exceed the Word Limit in Appellant's Brief, and would respectfully show the Court the following:

I.

By judgment dated August 24, 2017, appellant was convicted of the offense of murder in Cause Number 1435566 in the 178th District Court of Harris County, Texas, styled *The State of Texas v. SANDRA JEAN MELGAR*. Her punishment was assessed at twenty-seven (27) years imprisonment in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice Institutional Division and a fine of \$10,000.00.

II.

The Appellant on this date has timely submitted her Brief but it exceeds the word limit. Appellant requests the Court to authorize its filing.

III.

As this Court is aware, the record on appeal in this matter is quite lengthy—over 3,000 pages. The reporter’s record, consisting of 17 volumes, is 2,112 pages and the clerk’s record consists of 920 pages. Additionally, 1,067 exhibits were admitted into evidence. The trial lasted nearly three weeks. Twenty-five (25) witnesses testified at trial, many of whom were the subject of lengthy direct and cross-examinations. To read and comprehensively review a record of this size is a time-consuming and daunting task.

IV.

Sandy Melgar (hereinafter referred to as “Sandy”) was accused of murdering her husband. This was a tenuous circumstantial evidence case and the trial was complex. CSU Investigators took over 1,000 photographs at the scene of the crime. Forensic testing for the presence of DNA and blood evidence was done. Trace evidence was submitted for laboratory analysis to both the Harris County Institute of Forensic

Science and the DPS Crime Laboratory. A multitude of laboratory reports were issued and then amended reports followed. Computers and cell phones obtained from the crime scene were submitted to the Harris County Regional Computer Laboratory for analyses. Both blood spatter and fluorescein testing evidence was offered by the prosecution in its effort to prove Sandy's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Sandy was interrogated by Homicide detectives for several hours which was videotaped and later admitted into evidence at trial. A transcript of the videotape, prepared by the Harris County Sheriff's Department, was determined to be inaccurate in several respects and was not offered into evidence. It was, however, fifty (50) pages in length and single-spaced. Accordingly, it was necessary for appellant to utilize time stamps on the admitted videotape to isolate questions and answers in order to accurately cite to the videotape itself—State's Exhibit 673. This necessary but exceedingly laborious process has complicated and, to some extent, elongated the brief.

Sandy suffers from a number of health issues including seizure disorders, rheumatoid arthritis and lupus. These health issues played a significant role in the trial. Medical records and expert testimony in the field of neurology were admitted.

The defense adduced DNA expert witness testimony, as well as expert witness testimony from a well-respected former homicide detective. Medical examiner testimony was extensive in light of the fact that the victim, Sandy's husband, Jaime, was brutally beaten, suffered several skull fractures (as well as broken bones to the front of his face), and was repeatedly stabbed to death. Both out-of-court and in-court demonstrations took place which were the subject of extensive direct and cross-examinations.

V.

Sandy steadfastly denied killing her husband. The defense contended that he was murdered by home invaders. Sandy was found in the bathroom closet tied up tightly with her arms bound behind her back and ankles tied. The back of a chair had been wedged underneath the door knob on the outside of the closet door, preventing it from being opened from the inside. When found by family members of the deceased, Sandy was in hysterics, and did not know that her husband's butchered body had been found on the floor of the bedroom closet. Sandy did not exhibit injuries consistent with such a brutal attack. Sandy had no injuries to her hands, no broken fingernails, she was not bleeding, and had no blood on her or her clothes.

If she were, in fact, the killer, there would have been physical evidence corroborating such. Later evidence showed that none of Jaime Melgar's blood or DNA was found on Sandy and none of her DNA was found on him. Blood evidence was largely confined to the closet where Jaime was killed and in the area immediately outside of the closet. Except for blood on a knife in the bathroom Jacuzzi, forensic testing established there was no blood found anywhere else in the house and there was *no* evidence of any effort to clean up blood, e.g. eliminate evidence. However, foreign third-party DNA, not associated with the Melgars or family members, was found on many items of evidentiary significance. The State theorized that the crime scene had possibly been staged which was addressed in the Court of Appeals' opinion.

The central issue raised in this appeal is the legal sufficiency of the evidence. This is a *fact-intensive inquiry* that is subject to "an exacting standard as any factual sufficiency standard." *Butler v. State*, 769 S.W.2d 234 (Tex. Crim. App. 1989). The

countervailing evidence, as well as the evidence which supports the verdict, must be reviewed on appeal. *Brooks v. State*, 323 S.W.3d 893, 899 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010). And, a reasonable doubt may arise from the *absence* of evidence, resulting in legally insufficient evidence. *Mitchell v. State*, 650 S.W.2d 801 (Tex. Crim. App. 1983). Review of legal sufficiency is a “highly individualized assessment.” *Carrizales v. State*, 414 S.W.3d 737, 742 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013). It requires an exhaustive examination of the “events occurring *before, during* and *after* the commission of the offense.” *Cordova v. State*, 698 S.W.2d 107, 111 (Tex. Crim. pp. 1985) (Emphasis added). Additionally, “actions of the defendant which show an understanding and common design to do the prohibited act”, if any, must be analyzed. *Id.*

Of special relevance to this case is this rule: a review of the trial record to determine whether the evidence in a given case is legally sufficient is more a test of *quality* than quantity; the *character, weight* and *amount* of evidence must *all* be considered. *Brooks, supra*, at 906. The defendant and her counsel maintain the jury’s verdict is not rational based on the trial record. This case was poorly investigated, conclusions were reached which were not fairly supported by the evidence, and, in the final analysis, were “based on mere speculation or factually unsupported inferences or presumptions.” *Hooper v. State*, 214 S.W.3d 9, 14 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007). As Judge Cochran reasoned in her concurring opinion in *Brooks v. State, supra*, “the standard of proof *and review* in criminal cases has been expressed, not by the quantity of evidence produced or how it might be weighed neutrally, but rather *by the quality of the evidence and the level of certainty* it engenders in the factfinder’s mind.” *Id.* at 917-918. (Emphasis added). Precisely because of this standard, counsel have

conducted an exhaustive examination and analysis of the trial record—evidence from both the State and defense—to demonstrate that the prosecution did not bear its heavy burden of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Court of Appeals did not fairly analyze all the evidence in the record and other evidence was inaccurately recited or mischaracterized. Key defensive factual points were simply ignored. Counsel respectfully submits that the panel opinion’s legal analysis is incorrect and incomplete.

The undersigned counsel have spent considerable time deconstructing the appellate record, breaking it down, and analyzing what did and did not take place at trial. The submitted brief is not a chronological overview of the trial proceedings or a sequential recitation of events that took place at trial. Rather, it attempts to synthesize testimony and exhibits from throughout the trial to better explain what actually occurred, and to demonstrate that the prosecution failed to discharge its burden of proving Sandy’s guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Testimony and exhibits spread over nearly three weeks of trial are brought together, when relevant, to explain the import of various events or issues. It is respectfully submitted that this process will benefit the Court as it grapples with the sheer volume of evidence and evaluates its legal sufficiency. The brief is a roadmap that discusses and analyzes both the State’s and defendant’s presentations which will be useful to the Court. Attached hereto is a copy of the Table of Contents from the Brief for Appellant.

It is respectfully submitted that the undersigned counsel cannot, consistent with their ethical and constitutional obligations to their client, discuss and analyze the

testimony and evidence admitted at trial, as well as the legal significance of the same, with sufficient clarity in the length limitations otherwise imposed by Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure 9.4(i)(2)(B).¹ Appellant’s original brief in the Court of Appeals on December 6, 2018 was 325 pages in length and 97,352 words. The Court struck the brief and it was redrafted. Significant cuts were made in an effort to shorten its length. Counsel re-submitted the brief, raising only two (2) issues and greatly reducing its length to 205 pages and 57,521 words—a reduction from the original of 120 pages and nearly 40,000 words. On February 19, 2019, the revised brief was accepted by the Court of Appeals.

VI.

The Brief for Appellant on Petition for Discretionary Review filed this date is 27,389 words—a reduction of more than 30,000 words from the revised brief filed in and accepted by the Court of Appeals. Given the complexities of this case, the gravity of the punishment, the substantial countervailing evidence which must be considered, and the significant and “exacting” analysis that, constitutionally, must be undertaken in a legal sufficiency review of the Court of Appeals’ opinion, it is respectfully

¹In its Statement of Facts, the undersigned counsel have not attempted to analyze the evidence as to the legal sufficiency of the evidence in light of the strictures imposed by T.R.A.P. 38.1(g): “The brief must state concisely and *without argument* the facts pertinent to the issues or points presented.” (Emphasis added). As a result, the issue raised here –legal sufficiency of the evidence–necessitates some repeating of the evidence in the “Argument” portion of the brief to give context to that evidence and apply the legal analysis standard to it. This results in a lengthier brief than one where the points of error do not concern the legal sufficiency of the evidence.

It is also respectfully submitted that the evidence presented in this case, due to its inherent circumstantial nature, is far more fact-intensive and complex than that litigated in most death penalty cases, at least those tried by undersigned counsel. (See T.R.A.P. 9.4(i)(2)(A) which authorizes 37,500 words, if computer-generated.)

requested that this Court allow the filing of an enlarged brief in this case and that this motion be granted.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Appellant prays that this Court grant the Motion for Authorization to Exceed the Word Limit in Appellant's Brief.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ George M. Secrest, Jr.

GEORGE McCALL SECREST, JR.

State Bar No. 17973900

BENNETT & SECREST, PLLC

1545 Heights Blvd. Suite 800

Houston, Texas 77008

(713) 757-0679

(713) 650-1602 (FAX)

Allison Secrest

State Bar No. 24054622

1545 Heights Blvd. Suite 700

Houston, Texas 77008

(713) 222-1212

(713) 650-1602 (FAX)

Attorneys for the Defendant,

SANDRA JEAN MELGAR

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion for Authorization to Exceed the Word Limit in Appellant's Brief has been furnished to Ms. Stacey M. Soule, State Prosecuting Attorney, information@spa.texas.gov and Mr. Clinton Morgan, morgan_clinton@dao.hctx.net, on this 4th day of November, 2020.

/s/ George McCall Secrest, Jr.
GEORGE McCALL SECREST, JR.

ATTACHMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
NAMES OF ALL PARTIES.	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.	viii
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROCEDURAL HISTORY OF THE CASE.	2
GROUND FOR REVIEW.	3

GROUND FOR REVIEW NUMBER ONE

Did the Court of Appeals’ legal sufficiency of the evidence analysis comport with *Jackson v. Virginia*’s **additional** requirement that a reviewing court must determine “whether any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt”, especially when the panel mischaracterized crucial evidence, failed to fairly and critically assess what the record evidence showed, and ultimately supplied “a bridge to the analytical gap” in the prosecution’s case, by theorizing or guessing about the meaning of evidence and reaching conclusions based on speculation, conjecture, and inferences unsupported by the record evidence? 3

GROUND FOR REVIEW NUMBER TWO

Consistent with Due Process, in an appellate review of the legal sufficiency of evidence, can a jury’s assumed disbelief of certain witness testimony establish *substantive proof to the contrary of that testimony*? 3

GROUND FOR REVIEW NUMBER THREE

Did the Court of Appeals fail to apply part of the legal sufficiency standard which, according to *Brooks v. State*, “essentially incorporates a factual sufficiency review into” a review for legal sufficiency? 3

GROUND FOR REVIEW NUMBER FOUR

Did the Court of Appeals in its review of the legal sufficiency of the evidence fail to consider *all* of the trial evidence as required by *Jackson v. Virginia*, as opposed to just the evidence tending to support the verdict, although not establishing guilt beyond a reasonable doubt? 3

STATEMENT OF FACTS 4

- I. No one answers the door at the Melgar residence when the family arrives for dinner. 4
 - A. Herman Melgar enters the residence through the open garage door and an unlocked interior door at the back of the garage. 4
 - B. Herman and Maria find Sandy locked in the master *bathroom* closet and tied so tightly she has to be cut out of her bindings; Jaime is found slain in the master *bedroom* closet. 4
- II. EMS and Constables arrive; Sandy is found “crying hysterically” “inconsolable”, “in shock”, and “has experienced a loss of time”. . . . 6
- III. There are no signs of “forced entry” but investigators are oblivious to the fact that a garage door is *up* and the interior door leading into the residence from the garage does *not* lock and the doorknob is *broken*.. . . . 9

IV.	Inspection of the premises.	10
A.	Interior of garage and door leading into residence.	10
B.	Dogs and puppies.	11
C.	Master bedroom and bathroom.	11
1.	Master bedroom—investigators turn a “blind eye” to the fact that a television, prescription drugs, and cash from Jaime’s billfold and Sandy’s purse are missing.	11
2.	Master bedroom closet.	14
3.	Master bathroom.	15
4.	Master bathroom closet.	18
D.	DNA and Blood Evidence.	19
1.	No blood evidence links Sandy to the crime. Even though Jaime was brutally murdered and stabbed multiple times, no blood was found in the house except in the master bedroom closet, the immediate vicinity outside the closet, and on the knife in the Jacuzzi. Sandy was not cut, had not bled, and none of her blood was found anywhere in the house, nor was any of Jaime’s blood found on Sandy or on any of her clothing. There was no evidence of blood transfer associated with removing bloody clothing or gloves and chemical processing established there was no attempt to clean the sinks, shower, or Jacuzzi.	19

2.	No DNA links Sandy to the crime. The State calls no DNA expert; uncontroverted forensic findings establish the presence of non-family <i>third-party</i> DNA; Sandy’s DNA is not found mixed in Jaime’s blood or on his body and Jaime’s DNA is not on Sandy’s body ..	23
3.	Law enforcement fails to swab or process the bloody handle of the safe in the closet next to Jaime’s body for DNA or fingerprints despite Carrizal’s representation to the contrary.	25
E.	Speculation about the possible “meaning” of the crime scene by law enforcement.	26
1.	The false premise of no forced entry.	26
2.	The false premise of no missing property.	27
a.	The missing television.	27
b.	The moved Xbox.	28
c.	The overlooked backpack with items taken and moved..	29
d.	Items missing and reported stolen.	30
3.	Possible “staging” of the crime scene.	31
V.	Examination of Sandy’s body and clothing.	33
A.	Sandy voluntarily executes consent forms.	33
B.	Absence of evidence on Sandy’s hands is inconsistent with her being the murderer.	33

C.	Bruises on Sandy’s body are consistent with her being bound and assaulted.	34
VI.	Jaime Melgar’s autopsy discloses a violent and brutal attack inconsistent with Sandy’s medical condition and her being the killer.	35
VII.	Detectives arrive and immediately focus on Sandy.	38
A.	The open garage door thwarts law enforcement’s theory of “no forced entry” so detectives embark on a mission to get the garage door closed and the interior garage door locked.	41
B.	Jaime gets out of the Jacuzzi to check on the barking dogs and never returns.	44
C.	“Screaming and running through the house”—a theory created by the detectives without any evidentiary support.	45
D.	Sandy’s limited memory of the events and the pain she was experiencing is consistent with her suffering a seizure and/or blow to the head.	46
E.	There is no evidence of domestic abuse or violence—another theory without any evidentiary basis.	51
F.	Carrizal attempted to file murder charges (even before the CSU leaves the premises) and is rebuffed by the District Attorney’s Office.	52
G.	Most of Sandy’s statements provided to investigators were corroborated by undisputed facts.	53

VIII.	Following a lengthy interrogation, Sandy is returned home.	54
A.	The Armstrongs arrive and find Sandy cold, shaking, in shock, and not very responsive.	54
B.	Tom cannot secure the interior door; Tammy feels a bump on Sandy’s head.	55
C.	Elizabeth Melgar returned from Europe—her father had been brutally murdered and her mother was the only suspect	56
IX.	Non-investigation conducted by Carrizal and Dousay.	56
A.	Despite statements made to Sandy that he would doggedly investigate the case, Dousay is totally disengaged, indifferent and does very little meaningful work.. . . .	56
B.	Detectives meet with Elizabeth Melgar but give her the run-a-round and “blow her off” despite the fact that she provides additional information supporting her mother’s innocence	57
C.	Law enforcement refuses to follow leads.	61
X.	Sandy and Jaime’s loving relationship and reputation for being peaceable, even-tempered, and non-violent.. . . .	62
XI.	Critical examination of the “investigation” by former veteran homicide detective, William “Billy” Belk, an expert in homicide investigations, shows tunnel vision, bias, and “unconscionable” shortcomings.	64
XII.	Forensic examination of computers and cell phones shows no evidence of planning, research, financial incentives or extramarital affairs.	69

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.	70
<p> GROUND S FOR REVIEW RESTATED. 71-72 </p>	
<p> ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES. 72 </p>	
<p> I. The legal sufficiency of the evidence standard as explained by the Supreme Court in <i>Jackson v. Virginia</i>, and by the Court of Criminal Appeals in <i>Brooks v. State</i> and <i>Hooper v. State</i>. </p>	72
<p> II. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is an exacting burden to establish and never shifts to the defense. </p>	78
<p> III. Application of the law to the facts <i>sub judice</i>. </p>	79
<p> A. In finding the evidence legally sufficient as a matter of law, the panel’s opinion impermissibly supplies “a bridge to the analytical gap” in the prosecution’s evidence. The jury’s verdict was not rational and conclusions the panel asserts the jury was free to draw were based on speculation.. . . . </p>	79
<p> B. The panel’s acceptance of the prosecution’s theories concerning how Sandy <i>could</i> have tied herself up and locked herself in the bathroom closet, was not based on record facts but founded upon speculation about the possible meaning of evidence. </p>	80
<p> C. Uncontroverted forensic and physical evidence does not support any finding that Sandy washed blood off of herself. </p>	84
<p> D. Sandy’s medical and physical condition do not support any reasonable inference that she killed Jaime. </p>	86

E.	The panel’s reliance on “no signs of forced entry”, supposedly no missing property, and possible “staging”, does not fairly assess the record evidence; conclusions drawn therefrom are based, largely, on speculation and factually unsupported inferences.	89
F.	The panel’s conclusion that “inconsistencies” in Sandy’s statements authorized the jury to find “the entire defense was not credible” is not fairly supported by the record. In any event, reliance on “inconsistent” statements as affirmative evidence of guilt unconstitutionally lowered the State’s burden of proof.	95
G.	Lack of motive undermines the verdict rationality.	99
CONCLUSION.		101
PRAYER FOR RELIEF.		102
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.		103
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.		103